

REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 8, 2006. By the present amendment, Applicants propose to cancel claims 7, 9, 12, 14, 59-77, and 104 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments present no new issues, would not require further consideration or searching by the examiner, and place the case in condition for allowance or in a better condition for appeal. Applicant requests entry of the proposed amendments and prompt and favorable consideration of the pending claims.

In the Office Action, claims 69-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. By the present amendment, Applicant proposes to cancel claims 69-71 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. As a result, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 59-62, 64-70, 72, 73, and 104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,417,745 to Sheldon (the '745 patent). By the present amendment, the Applicant proposes to cancel claims 59-62, 64-70, 72, 73, and 104 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 63, 71, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over the '745 patent. By the present amendment, the Applicant proposes to cancel claims 63, 71, and 74 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/729,668
Amdt. dated July 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed May 8, 2006

The Office Action rejected claims 75-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over the '745 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,501,266 to McDaniel (the '266 patent). By the present amendment, the Applicant proposes to cancel claims 75-77 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15-23, 25-37, 59-77, and 102-104 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,017,305. By the present amendment, the Applicant has canceled claims 59-77 and 104 and hereby submits a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321 (c). A copy of the Revocation of Power of Attorney form from U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/526,949 is enclosed. Please charge the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20 (d) to Deposit Account **21-0550**. **TWO (2) COPIES OF THIS SHEET ARE ENCLOSED.**

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15-23, 25-37, 102, and 103 are otherwise allowable.

Appl. No. 10/729,668
Amdt. dated July 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed May 8, 2006

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the application, namely claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15-23, 25-37, 102, and 103, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner desire a telephonic interview to resolve any outstanding matters, the Examiner is sincerely invited to contact the undersigned at (631) 501-5713.

Respectfully submitted,



Dana A. Brussel
Reg. No. 45,717
Attorney for Applicant

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP
445 Broad Hollow Road - Suite 225
Melville, New York 11747
Tel.: (631) 501-5713
Fax: (631) 501-3526

Send correspondence to:
Chief Patent Counsel
Tyco Healthcare Group
195 McDermott Road
North Haven, CT 06473